## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FLORENCIO VALLEJO,	) No. C 07-4536 JSW (PR)
Petitioner,	ODDED DENVING
VS.	ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY
ROSEANNE CAMPBELL, Warden,	)
Respondent.	(Docket nos. 16, 17)

Petitioner, a prisoner of the State of California, filed a *pro se* 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for a writ of habeas corpus. In an order dated December 15, 2008, this Court dismissed the petition as untimely (docket no. 14). Petitioner has filed a notice of appeal (docket no. 16) and a motion seeking a certificate of appealability (docket no. 17).

A judge shall grant a COA "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). "Determining whether a COA should issue where the petition was dismissed on procedural grounds has two components, one directed at the underlying constitutional claims and one directed at the district court's procedural holding." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000). "When the district court denies a habeas petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's underlying constitutional claim, a COA should issue when the prisoner shows, at least, that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Id.* at 484; *see James v. Giles*, 221 F.3d 1074, 1077 (9th Cir. 2000). As each of these components is a

"threshold inquiry," the federal court "may find that it can dispose of the application in a fair and prompt manner if it proceeds first to resolve the issue whose answer is more apparent from the record and arguments." *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 485. Supreme Court jurisprudence "allows and encourages" federal courts to first resolve the procedural issue. *See id*.

Petitioner has not established that "jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Id.* at 484. Accordingly, the request for a certificate of appealability is DENIED (docket no. 17). The Clerk of Court shall forward this order, along with the case file, to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. *United States v. Asrar*, 116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 26, 2009

JEFFREY S. WHITE United States District Judge

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE	
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
4		
5		
6	FLORENCIO P VALLEJO, Case Number: CV07-04536 JSW	
7	Plaintiff, CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
8	V.	
9	DERAL G ADAMS et al,	
10	Defendant.	
11		
12	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. Distri Court, Northern District of California.	
13	That on May 26, 2009, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said	
14	copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositin said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery	
15	receptacle located in the Clerk's office.	
16		
17	El ' D V II ' D 71000	
18	Florencio P. Vallejo P-71999 Corcoran State Prison	
19	A-3-173 L P.O. Box 5242	
20	Corcoran, CA 93212	
21	Dated: May 26, 2009	
22	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		